

M2049
Thursday, July 29, 1971
Barn
Group II
Grammar of Work, tape 8 of 9

Mr. Nyland: So we will begin without light, if you don't mind. While you're all here together, I may say, "Please don't forget that the end of the month is at the end of this week," and those responsible for Activities I would like to remember ... for them to remember that they have an obligation. I will ask Katie to take care of it, to ask you or to remind you. And don't fail. Last month was very good, except one or two. I just want to say that. Because it belongs in a general way to ourselves, and I'm still trying to find out how much you actually want to continue with this kind of work. For me, that is one of the indications.

I think many times about what will happen ... where will we be in the future and what is there at the present time that I could consider coherence, and it is a very difficult problem even to judge or to have enough information about it. But it is very much worthwhile to consider how close are we and how willing are we, totally, in our interest about Gurdjieff and Work on oneself. Every once in a while I think you should remember that, and seriously consider it and see what your attitude is. It has to grow more. We'll talk more about it, as you know, because it's not out of my mind at all. It's very, very important.

So now, questions and answers.

Bob Kosut: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Oh, but you're quick.

Bob: Bob Kosut.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Bob.

Bob: You spoke the other day about sheep and the shepherd and then the sheep being slaughtered, and there's times that ... that I understand it for myself in a sense of a realization of bondage, and Work ... Work means freedom. But even with that kind of realization, it's like

Gurdjieff says in the beginning of All and Everything about ... by ‘centuries rooted in him,’ and I start ... I start to see that, but on the other hand there’s times when I’m more open, like sometimes standing next to a window and a breeze could come in and I’m ... it’s a different kind of ... it seems different. I want to go in the direction of life.

Mr. Nyland: It’s really not a question, is it.

Bob: I don’t know how to formulate it as a question.

Mr. Nyland: So far it’s a statement about certain conditions in which you find yourself. It should be broadened. If one has realizations sometimes that perhaps I am a sheep, or that there is that kind of a relation between Organic Kingdom as represented by Mankind and some other law which is not of the Earth but by which Mankind, you might say, is ‘manipulated’ or which causes Mankind to be bound to the Earth, one starts to question about the purpose why that happens to be so. And to some extent it is allegorical. One can have all kind of ideas about the reason why Mankind happens to live on Earth; also why the Earth is the way it is and not like something else. And I think when one tries to think about it in a cosmological sense, that you can probably assign certain reasons why the Earth happens to be at the place ‘Fa’ of a Cosmic Ray.

But again, you get stuck on the idea of a Cosmic Ray; because why should there be Cosmic Rays, and why should there be a central point which we call the ‘Sun Absolute’ which is, as a concept, completely opposite to any other kind of a concept of Infinity. And I think our mind at the present time is really not very much capable of understanding the reasons for that, and I believe until one has reached a certain insight or a development, or also that what are the secrets of esoteric knowledge have become a little bit more disclosed, that one really would only find an answer—and perhaps only a part of an answer—at the moment when one dies and enters into a new kind of a realm where there is already freedom from a physical body.

That it goes up and down—that is, that at times I am convinced that there is a very definite relationship or the reason for Mankind to be on Earth—and that I find myself, like a black sheep, questioning the reasons and rebelling against even the assumption that that must be so, and who do I consider when I live, for myself, my shepherd, of course I start to think about such ideas when I’m by myself and I cannot reconcile this question of going up and down or ... and taking in and in letting out, or that what is at times intense and at times more superficial. Because it’s a concept: When I say that I once become convinced, why am I not all the time convinced, and

why should I be subject to hesitations and at times accelerations. Again I say, it is the kind of a question that I really don't feel I'm entitled to the answer.

I have to keep on remaining much more pragmatic about what I find for myself to be the state of myself; and although symbolic and allegorical ideas can help me, I have to keep my feet on the ground as far as I'm concerned as a human being. And with all the different attributes and talents and whatever I may possess, I have to keep on thinking and feeling about myself, and not necessarily influenced—or being influenced—by the fact, which may be true, of a Cosmic Ray existing which, if I could believe in it, I could start to try to apply within myself in the state in which I am. And the question, then, of ... if the Cosmic Ray and the Earth containing it is at the place 'Fa' of that Ray: Where is the place 'Fa' for me? ... and to what extent can I then compare myself to something created on the Earth for the purpose like a Cosmic Ray, but then also having the difficulties, which the planet—or the unfortunate planet—Earth seems to experience, of being at the place of 'Fa' and not being able to go further. If I continue to think about that, what is it really that I could compare, or to what extent is the symbolism justified and can I use it in my own case and my own experience.

I see that I am, in my desire to wish to Work, also at the state 'Fa'; and I consider that then, trying to illustrate it schematically by a comparison of the development of my Kesdjanian body which for me, in the development of myself, is really a very central point in the possibility of a development in the totality as represented by three bodies. And why I call it 'Fa' is simply that at the point where I start to consider myself, and sometimes I call it that 'Man Number Four' who wishes to grow up, that then the 'Do-Re-Mi' of the Kesdjanian scale is really the part—at 'Mi,' or where it would like to cross 'Fa'—the point at which, seen from the totality of the development of a Man, a Man is only half way in his development of his own Octave of evolution allotted to him as far as the Earth is concerned.

Now, if I understand that I am at that point in myself, I determine that it is an emotional state in which I am interested in the possibilities of further growth. But I'm hampered by conditions under which I happen to live; and I say again, the same way as the Earth being at the place in the Cosmic scale where it is impossible for the Earth itself to overbridge the 'Fa' state and become a real planet, my difficulty is exactly the same: That I cannot become a real Man when I'm still at the 'Fa' stage where I consider the possibility and I hope for the potentiality to be actualized for myself.

This determines—or illustrates—the reason why my desire is not constant. You see, I am, at the ‘Fa,’ in a kind of a state of liquidity. I would like to have certain things happen to me in this emotional state; wanting to include in my emotions all kind of forms of life and not be satisfied with what I am within myself as having feeling only, that then at times that desire is so strong that almost I could move mountains. But being in the ‘Do-Re-Mi’ and not at ‘Fa,’ really, and not having even been able to overbridge a little bit of that ‘Fa’ bridge, I am subject to the laws of gravitation which are expressed in the ‘Do,’ ‘Re,’ ‘Mi,’ and return constantly to the ‘Mi,’ ‘Re,’ ‘Do’—as it were, the beginning of the possibility of Kesdjanian body.

This causes the fluctuation within my feelings. It’s not my mind. My mind, when it is once clear, it stands out like a ‘Do.’ When the ‘Do’ is there and the clarification of Work has been sufficiently, let’s call it, ‘illustrated’ or ‘discussed,’ or when the clarity of the simplicity has been there, once and for all I know what Work is and I know what I ought to do and I know what is involved in it, because in my simplicity of the mind ‘Do,’ which is the beginning of the Soul body, at that particular point the ‘Do’ is equal to the ‘Fa’ of Kesdjan. And when I talk about Work, that point ‘Do’ in its intellectual capacity is turned towards the potentiality of the Soul in its own Octave, but as far ... so I’m not subject there to any particular detraction from that point. It has been struck and that’s all, I haven’t done anything about it. I’m not as yet subject to the ‘Do,’ ‘Re,’ ‘Mi’ of an intellectual body, but I have very definitely in my mind an assurance of what is clear and what I should do. But when I want to look at the motivating force to sustain the desire of changing that what I know as knowledge into an activity, I become subject to the Triunity Law of the ‘Do-Re-Mi’ of Kesdjan, and I’m all the time dependent on my feeling wishing to go over into an emotional state and returning again to an ordinary state of sleep.

Now together with this, of course this ‘Do-Re-Mi’ of the Kesdjanian body is not free. It’s not free like the ‘Do’ of the Soul is free. The ‘Do-Re-Mi’ of Kesdjan is connected with the ‘Sol-La-Si’ of my physical body, and my feeling is practically a part—that is, considered to belong to—my physical body. And therefore the fluctuations in the ‘Do-Re-Mi’ are also the same fluctuations in the ‘Sol-La-Si’ of my physical body, because they are parallel. And then I can explain why I vacillate: Because the ‘Sol-La-Si’ of myself, which includes my ordinary thought, my ordinary feelings, and my ordinary ability for procreation—because that is what is the ‘Sol,’ ‘La,’ ‘Si’ of the physical body—is constantly in a state of flux. You might say that is ‘necessary’ for the ‘Sol-La-Si’ to prepare for the ‘Si-Do’ of its death, and that is why I fluctuate in my

Kesdjanian body: Because I'm still reminded of that where I came from and I'm not free as yet with the aim that I want to pursue.

It might sound a little theoretical, but it has to be explained—the reason why I cannot be ... I cannot sustain for myself such a strong desire. Because the physical body is an indication of the temporariness of life on Earth, and I do not ... in my ordinary existence and what we call ‘unconscious,’ I do not wish to think about my death. That is my mind. My feeling is not sufficiently developed to encompass it; and procreation has been given to overcome it—those thoughts and those feelings—in another kind of activity which could almost guarantee me the continuation of life, and I'm shifted over to that kind of a concept instead of wanting to consider the real ‘Si-Do’ of my life as a means of a new Octave beginning at the ‘Do’—that is, the moment when I would die.

You see, this explains why a Man has to be what he is, and we simply say it is a machine which ‘runs,’ but is not constantly fed to make the velocity continuous and always equal—one second or a moment previous—to the moment which comes next.

All right?

Bob: Yes.

Zev Guber: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Zev: Zev Guber.

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Zev: Um, there was a statement in de Hartmann's book that was attributed to Gurdjieff, and to the effect that what's good for the personality is bad for the essence, and what's bad for the personality is good for the essence. Um, and coupled with that, I just finished reading the Ivan Osokin, and it had a great effect on me. I mean, I was totally identified with Osokin. I see myself repeating the action, not wanting to change, trying to look back in the past and understanding what had occurred and thinking that it will be different in the future. And I see that it, uh ... even knowing to a certain extent what had occurred in the past doesn't necessarily make it any different in the future. I mean, I carry my unconsciousness with me, and I wonder how ... how can I somehow reconcile the desires of a personality and the desires of my essence. And I see that there's a difference and that when I feed one I don't feed the other, but I don't know what to do.

Mr. Nyland: I'm not so sure about that, but I think you answer your own question. Why are you not Ivan Osokin; it's exactly because you don't realize how much personality binds you and because of that, how little you can give to your essence. It's a determination that one has to make. Ivan makes a determination at a certain point, and although it is not ... it's very beautifully described how he, as it were, almost 'flows' into it, but the advantage of Ivan is that when he experiences it he recognizes it, and then there is no further questioning involved. You see, that is really what happens. What de Hartmann means is, that as long as I keep on believing in the personality, I will never believe in my essence.

Now, if there could be a point when I actually consider the essence more important than my personality, then I would 'do away,' as it were, with my personality and try to live in an essential way. But I don't want to do that; because I don't feel strong enough about having that kind of a wish, and I never would want to fulfill the question of giving up my personality in order to live in my essence only. It's an impossibility. Only a tremendous shock ... or a killing of myself might do it, but I'm not certain that the essence would remain in existence even if I commit suicide, so also for that reason I don't do it, and I've no assurance whatsoever.

In general, you can say the reason that it doesn't happen, or that there are no people where it actually takes place, is simply that they don't recognize a good thing when they see it. And we are so tremendously covered up and we are so far away from simplicity of people who, in the olden days were not as much encumbered by all the so-called 'progress' or the good ... the good gifts of, uh, industry and commercial development and our ideas completely based on that what is the easiest to be done without exerting an effort; as a result of all the kind of conditioning, of the education that we have received and the conditions under which we live here in this life—that is, this particular kind of culture of ourselves—that we are incapable even of seeing a difference between essence and personality. Even if you tried, you won't be able to say this is 'essential' or something else is more like a 'surface,' or belonging more to personality. We are not honest about it, and there is absolutely no desire in us to give up one thing and to follow another, and we want to straddle the issue and hope that by a little bit of attention that one pays to one's essence, it still would be possible to have both. A Man honestly is made up of an idea that he can have his pie and eat it, and when it comes to the question of giving up his pie or giving up his eating, he says, "I won't do it," because I prefer the eating of the pie, and never mind what happens afterwards.

I say it's a question of 'impossibility' in our present stage. I think that culture has made it extremely difficult for us to see straight, and I think it is quite exceptional that people become interested even in the ideas of evolution. And there are very few who really become interested, and although theoretically the possibility exists for everybody and it is no particular secret that cannot be disclosed, the probability—taking them out of the possibility—certainly is ten percent, even if it is that.

But then one becomes interested. And then what happens: You're not constantly trying to apply what you know with your mind, and what you should do. You will find all kind of excuses why you should not do it, and you will find all kind of substitutes which you believe will work just as well. And still, you are not willing to give up anything of the manifestations of your personality if it were an obstacle or in the way for the development of an essential quality. And look at yourself—or look at anybody looking at themselves—for how much do we, even knowing about Work, spend as time, let alone energy, as a wish to really Work? And it has nothing to do with the difficulty of Work. It simply has to do with, I don't want to pay attention to it, and I hope for the best and all the time I think that the personality will lead me somewhere. And that is why de Hartmann made that sharp distinction. Personality will not lead you to essential qualities.

You see what I mean? If one is honest, then become like Ivan and follow the master. Gurdjieff is the master. You're in contact with that. You have all the ability to know what he has said and what he means. You have all the chances in the world to read All and Everything as often as you possibly can and to try to digest it. You have been told enough times what is needed for Work; and you have to ask yourself, "Why in God's name, then, don't I Work"—that's the problem.

Yah.

Roselyn Buttenweiser: Mr. Nyland, it's Roselyn. Um, I've come back to a question that I've had, that I've asked before, that I've never been able to clarify; and that is, what it actually means to create little 'I'. Um, I think from my experiences I know what it is to have a body in activity, to have a wish and openness, but from there to create little 'I', I do things that I think it is, but sometimes ... most of the time I don't trust it. And I really don't understand what that means.

Mr. Nyland: Well, Roselyn, it is an experience that when one hasn't had it, it is very difficult to

describe. And when a person has had an experience and would like to describe it to someone else, he will have a hard time. Because the person who has not experienced is ... experienced it has no means of placing it. When I go over from one place to another and that where I want to go is entirely new and there is no map, I will not know what it will be.

If I'm clear about Work, I will—in Working—only establish, if I can, the fact of being Awake, which in our terminology means that something exists which starts to function differently from the mental functions which I call ‘thought.’ And in order to distinguish it, I use the word to become ‘Aware,’ so that this little ‘I’ in its function is Aware of myself.

Now, when I want to describe Awareness, I know it is a mental function because it gives facts of a certain kind which are also recorded in my mind and therefore it is very close to a result which I also could obtain by means of a thought process. But when I say to myself “Don’t think” and I say “Don’t think” and keep on saying it, part of my mind becomes so engaged in the statement that I should not think, that I really keep on thinking about not thinking. You see, I cannot do it that way. I cannot even say I wish my feeling to include much more of life; not only of myself, but if I say I am bound by my feeling for myself at that moment wishing something else to exist which is also life, then giving that, you might say, the ‘attention’ that it deserves, I’m still up against the fact that that form of life, when I wish it to be included in me, I remain identified with it. And again, I cannot describe what is meant by the emotion which is free from feeling.

So, I still have to try to define what is the closest, in my experience, in unconscious living which could remind me, or become indicative, of that what is really meant by the process of Awareness. Now, there are a few things that are quite close to it although they are not the thing itself, but they indicate the direction. For one, there is an experience every once in a while in one’s life in which one says, “I was there, but I did not function with any of my sense organs.” And when one claims that that happens as an experience in which then, again thinking about it afterwards, I say that I will “never forgot it,” if I try to trace it in my life as an experience in which that happened, I try to define again and again what it is as a state that I actually experienced. And if it actually is so that it reaches a state in which I say I will ‘not forgot’ that experience and try to think about it, I start to realize at that moment my mind was really not functioning and I had no feeling about myself, and at the same time there was a realization that I did exist.

This is one possibility. Another is that I try to see with my mind what could be the difference between thought and Awareness. You see, something must take place in me. *That* I know. What exactly will take place, I do not know because I'm not familiar with it. But I do remember that at certain times, using my eyes to look at the corner of a room—and of course being dependent on the shadows and how the three lines come together in the corner as one point—if I draw it on a piece of paper and the three lines are there and I put it in front of me and I look at it, I keep on looking and at a certain time the point comes towards me instead of receding. This is as indication that even with an ordinary visual, unconscious property that I have, something is taking place in my mind which is not taking place on the paper. And I cannot explain what actually changes this kind of a vision: When I see it first going away from me and then it comes towards me and it still is the same figure ... the same configuration on the sheet of paper.

That is another experience I know. The third: I say I am very sleepy and I'm ready to go to bed; I can already close my eyes; I stand in front of my bed; without getting into my bed as yet, I realize that I'm still standing; the sleep practically overtakes me, and for one moment I realize I exist, but I don't function in as ordinary sense. Such moments can take place. They are difficult because almost immediately either you fall asleep and fall on your bed, or you wake up again and accuse yourself that you almost fell asleep. The same thing happens when you are waking up out of physical sleep and in the morning, then, open your eyes and at that time the mind, not being cluttered as yet with ordinary thoughts and perhaps a little bit of a dream that might gradually recede, there is a certain definite moment of an equilibrium for oneself in which there is no thought and no feeling but the realization of being alive and in bed.

Now, I have such ideas—that every once in a while become an experience for me—which touch the possibility of a realization of what is really meant. Now I try, for myself, to change from the thought of myself to an Awareness of myself. It has to be very quiet for myself, in a state of relaxation in which there are no particular thoughts that I have to pay attention to. I just want to be as I am, and using then a Draining exercise or a relaxation process I see if my mind can be emptied practically of a thought process going on; and not paying any attention to whatever goes on and not even saying that I don't want to think, I can accept my mind, active as it will remain and definitely not free from thoughts. Because I cannot produce that; even if I would like it, if I tried I would keep on saying, "I want to be free from thoughts," and that would

be a thought in my mind. So it is utterly impossible to do that, but I can be ... at a certain time have a realization of an existence in which there are no thoughts—that is, no thoughts that concern me particularly, and no thoughts as a result of an influence of sense organs.

I sit quietly in a chair. I close my eyes to exclude visual impressions. I come to myself in the sense, now, that I want to relax so completely that all that exists I would like to be brain matter. I try to exclude the formulation of any kind of a word. I try to see if at that time there could be a realization of my existence which, like a flash, happens to come; and not because I happen to think about myself, but it is only because something apparently is still Aware of the existence of myself and all the other functions of an ordinary unconscious state—the five ordinary functions of myself—have disappeared or have receded in such a way that they really don't matter anymore. This one tries to do when you want to consider what it is to create little 'I'. It precedes the actual creation. It precedes that that what is then little 'I' starts to function, but I can put my body in that kind of a state of almost becoming in equilibrium regarding that what is my inner life only, and excluding everything of my outer life because it should not have the value when I'm interested in the development of my inner life.

There is no other way of trying to tell you. The only way for yourself is to try to continue to make experiments in which the little 'I' starts to function. The closer it can be having Impartiality—and if possible the question of Simultaneity, which has to be solved sometime—the closer it is to that as an actuality existing, the more then you will start to realize what is meant by an Awareness in the sense we mean it. So that, you might say, is another way of finding out: Through practical application and then, judging by certain results, coming back to that what is the origin of the result, functioning in a certain way which we call Objectively as 'Awareness'—different from the thought process.

There are different ways. I could mention several others, but I don't think it's important, even. You see, I come back all the time to the necessity of wanting to Work, and I do the best I can. And I don't want to define if that 'best' is still good enough or could be better. I cannot do better than what I do; but I keep on doing what I can, and because of this there will be practice that will make me perfect.

All right?

Roselyn: Yes. Thank you.

Fred Curchak: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Fred: It's Fred Curchak.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Fred.

Fred: I'm not simple and I know this keeps me from Work. It was clear last night when I tried to Work. I walked down the road and at one point I turned around, and seeing the planet Mars in the sky, I was inspired in my wish to have something Observe this body as if through a Teskooano from the planet Mars. And there was a deepening of my state and I began to make slow and simple movements, and there was some Impartial registration of this body existing. I tried to maintain that, but so quickly it went over into just an accelerated, complex mental and emotional activity. And that's why I'm not simple, and that's what keeps me from Work many times.

Mr. Nyland: But you're not always that complicated. It's illustrated by your own experience, that at a certain time when you walk outside and you are affected by something—beauty, awe, whatever it is; concepts that look like impossible to understand and you say, "there is infinite space"; whichever way you express it, you have very definitely a realization of something that then, at that time, something existed—that simply you continue having that and trying to increase it or to make it stay with you, that you use your ordinary mind for it and of course then spoil it. I think it is logical.

All right, Bill.

side 2 Of course, you can say that that is the 'state I am in,' or that's the 'kind of a person' I am, so one hopes that after this particular experience has been spoiled, that there may be another chance. Again, the thought of the experience can produce a little later a similarity of wishing it again—to have the same kind of a state and the same kind of experience. The difficulty then is that you would like to describe what it has been and that you try to determine what it ought to be. But if you could be free from that, if you could say simply, "Thank God I had that experience, I continue; somehow or other my thoughts spoiled it, but I would like to remain simple; let me see what I can make simple of myself as I am walking or perhaps as I sit somewhere." And I again relax and get out of my body all the different thoughts, out of my feeling that what really doesn't belong there, out of the tensions of the muscles everything that is not necessary, and I make such attempt to make this body, as an instrument, a little bit more able to have, you might call it now, the thought or the wish to 'do something' about myself.

At such a time, having prepared in that way, there is without any difficulty ... without any doubt, energy for that purpose. Even if it would last for a little... This is the continuation of such attempts as long as there is energy available, and even if it may be for once just a little bit like a dot, or extended as a little line and then a big hiatus and then again an attempt and again the same—a little dot which you like to extend—out of that kind of attempt, when the energy finally has been dissipated and is not there anymore, you will be able to look back on that experience as something very much worthwhile. The more there is worthwhileness in the experience, the more next time you are reminded that you have experienced in the past something that was right for you, and the more you will have within yourself a wish to do it again and again in a similar way.

It does not mean that one knows all the time what to do. And I'm afraid that the associations and the way we think—the way we are, the way we have been brought up and conditioning, rationalization, everything that belongs to the mind—is so terrible that even with the best wish in the world you cannot do anything. I've said it several times: Use common sense *not* to Work at that time, leave it until Mother Nature allows you again. Concentrate ... Or simply do ordinary things, if possible become active again and again. Don't sit. When you sit quiet and your physical body is not active, your mind and your feelings have such a chance to start to fight with each other that you really do not know what to do about it, but if you become active with your body, it will be linked up with either your mind or your feeling, and the contrast between the two, or the fighting, will not be there as much and for yourself you'll be in a such better state of balance in which, then, a thought can come or a feeling can come regarding Work.

Again the effort when extended, when you start with a little line and a little line and a little line, ultimately it will become a little longer and sometimes the little strips—the '*trait d'union*' as you call them in French—can be united; and not only dots, but the dots become a line as described when you move a pencil point over a paper and describe a line, or as you can visualize time flowing from one minute to another.

This is really the question: That only by constantly trying to make attempts of that kind hundreds of times and thousands of times during the day; under conditions partly as you described them, partly at times when you get up, times when you really have the time to come to yourself, time that you 'take off,' as it were, as a little section out of your ordinary existence and devote it with a possibility of an inner life development. There is no other way for Work than to Work. There are no particular shortcuts.

There are certain ways that gradually it becomes a little easier since you know how to handle the method better and there is more clarity, and at times there is also much more of a desire; and of course at times there are experiences of oneself, one's ordinary life, which are so terrible that as a result of the negativity—not wishing that—that you then change into the positivity of doing almost anything to get out of it. But, you see, much of that kind of material is very dangerous because it is always based on the kind of a thought or a feeling of an experience which you don't want, and then you go over into the wish of substituting and you are not clear or not pure anymore about the desire for Work.

The desire for Work is, of course, expressed as a form of energy which is in one and which should lead to the possibility of an Awakened state, but it should be completely free from any description of how you want it to be when you are Awake. And at such a time, try to remember what the Bible means by 'Not Thy will' ... 'Not my will, but Thine': That the totality of myself does not wish anything, than only within me there is that desire actually to make this—what I am—suitable for living on the next level of Being.

All right.

Who? Yea.

Ron Hayes: Mr. Nyland, Ron Hayes. Uh, when I have a wish to make an attempt, I have found that there's a certain recurring difficulty in that at times I try to force something to become present to me. And as I think about this, it seems that it's connected very much with the question of me being humble towards something much higher than myself. And my question is, how can I really, uh, become humble and in that way not try to force something.

Mr. Nyland: It is not necessarily connected. You can be humble, of course, with forcing and it does not mean that one has to flow over into the other. But, what you say is right: How can I be humble. It's a question; if I create or try to make ... to do my best to create something that I call a little 'I' and I give it certain attributes and sometimes when I say I wish this little 'I' to exist as if for me it could be a representation of God, then of course it is also a question I would want to ask myself: Why should this little 'I' wish to be there for me. And who am I that I even dare to ask for that kind of substance, of a different kind of a nature than that what I am made of, to exist for my purpose. Even if I say that I wish to create it, it is part of a much larger question: To what extent am I, as a human being, entitled to higher knowledge.

What have I ever done to pay. That is, if I ask and I pray to God and supposing that what I

ask for comes the next morning with parcel-post to my door. But it is a C.O.D. And I ask the postman "What for," should I pay? "Oh," he says, "Yes, it was sent from Heaven and they paid for it there, and now they want their money back." And I say, "How much?" "Oh," he says, "Oh, it's only a thousand dollars." And then you say, "Why should I pay that." I, human Man on Earth, living here, and I should pay Heaven? They can go to hell.

You see, this is my conclusion. When I say it is easy enough to say let me make a little 'I' ... but what will I *do* with it if it actually comes! As if it is God in His ... created in His image—dressed up as I would picture Him—and to be present to me in my privacy? I couldn't stand it, and I really would not know what I have done. It is like *Apprentice Sorcier*, you know? The fellow who had a little secret of starting something, and the magician had not told him how to turn it off—you remember that story.

Ron: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: And the water rose and rose and rose, you see. This is what I have to ask myself: I want to create a little 'I', am I ready to say 'A,' 'B,' 'C,' 'D' until the bitter end, am I willing to sacrifice what may be required or asked of me. How do I know what I will have to pay. Because I have started something that perhaps is in the direction of esoteric knowledge and I say I am entitled to it, but if it is given to me, do I know what to do with it.

So this brings up this question of humbleness: Am I really capable and able and suitable to be in the presence of that what I call a little 'I' for me. Because, you see, what is the question. I want this little 'I' to be an architect. I want that little 'I' to tell me in time—when, after I have made attempts, given it enough attention and I have given it food and I have tried to build it up or to feed it in some way or other; when it has been conceived first and when I intentionally now wish to make it grow up and become not only out of conception something that starts to live, but taking the responsibility for the continuation of that life; as it were, 'educating' it, or at least creating surroundings in which the little 'I' could feel at home and then gradually having grown up and more and more becoming mature—that then at such a time I hope that the little 'I' will actually deign it important enough to come and help me. And then again and again I ask, "Who am I" that I dare to ask this little 'I' to help me. And of course I can say flippantly, "Sure, but I created it." But I only created the wish into a little bit of an entity which has no life; and I ask God to put life in it, and that becomes the responsibility for Work.

Many times we forget that we should be humble, in the proper attitude towards that what

might come; and hope for it and to be able to continue to live with that ... and then see what is this personality and what is this requirement of making that what is little 'I' continue to grow, what is it I have to give up, what can I still keep.

So these are the problems that are involved in Work on oneself. When you want to create anything of that kind you should be, because of it, in a different state. And that what is a requirement of your personality and a wish, let's say, of your body or a wish of your mind or your feeling; that maybe at a certain time it will be asked to be given up, to be called for like the secret police will come to your door and claim you, claim certain things like the first born in Egypt and wish to kill it; claim your love for yourself; claim sometimes your uncontrolledness; claim your way of behavior as not becoming to you and not preparing sufficiently for what might be required for you to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

I use all kind of allegorical and metaphorical terms for this. Because I'm not talking about a Heaven, and I'm not talking about a God, and I'm not talking about certain conditions which have to be like this—and a description of Heaven with golden streets and so forth. I'm talking about ordinary affairs in my ordinary life: When I become acquainted with myself the way I am with all my tendencies and the characteristics I have, the way I happen to behave, the way I am stupid in such behavior, the way I am unwilling to overcome certain things because it costs me too much. *These* are the things that are the requirements of the maintenance of the little 'I'. *Why* do you think that the little 'I' doesn't want to stay. That's *my* fault! Or rather, it is my condition. That's the reason it cannot stay: Because it has a quality of an entirely different kind than what I am; and I cannot turn constantly that side—or that phase—of myself to the little 'I', and moreover I cannot be hypocritical because the little 'I', after all, would know what my honesty is worth.

The requirement on me—as I am when I say I create little 'I'—is much and much more than we ever think. We think that God will be good. He won't! And He won't pay attention to you. I create a little 'I' because God won't come down to me. That's the real reason. I know what God must be, and I know how God is. I understand a little bit about such attributes of the Lord. His Endlessness; if I see that for myself, who am I even to be in the presence of that; I'm not even worthy to kiss the edge of His robe. We forgot ... forget it so often. We think that Work is just that we're entitled to it, that all we have to do is "abracadabra, here we are." ABC: Just a little Observation, "Yes, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah," and a little Impartiality, also "Yah,

sure, we mix that," and Simultaneity, "Oh sure, that will come; here I am, Conscious Man." And I have all the different stupidities of myself, still with my personality and all the traits that I hang onto, and I don't want to give up.

Why do we talk so often, in this kind of a Group, about our behavior here at the Barn? Why is it necessary for me to come and sit here at this Barn: To bring back a little bit more of that what is the reality of Work, and not to allow certain things to take place which have absolutely no place in this building. That's why I do it: Because I value Work for oneself more than anything else. I value it more than getting tired for myself, or sacrificing whatever is my health. It's necessary that certain things should be understood in that light. And what is it that other people will, let's say 'match' me or want to do for themselves to match their effort, to realize that when they are saying "little 'I'" that they have an obligation to Be in the presence of that little 'I' that they create. We forget. And we know why we forget and we know how difficult it is, and it is not always possible to be different ... and all that what is this momentum, this inertia that is with us in an unconscious state, all the different forms of crystallization which we already, in the process of such crystallization, cannot dissolve anymore.

Because, we don't know what kind of solvent is necessary for it. We don't even know how to attack it. We don't even know where it is because it is so immersed ... immersed with all kind of things in my general personality and its behavior forms. It takes a little time to analyze it, even, and to make it so that we can attack it separately; because we are so afraid that in any kind of an attempt of using a solvent a whole lot of our dear, darling thoughts and marvelous feelings and all the rest—what we call for ourselves our own so-called 'respect'—that it also will go by the board and we would have to leave it, and then pretty soon, where will I be: standing there naked and no protection whatsoever? And, can I stand it in the presence of others?

These are the problems—not the other little bits of things of saying a little bit about it. You know Work. I mean, I don't have to explain it anymore. We've gone through it time and time again, and there are hundreds of tapes that can tell you. And All and Everything—you can find it in, I would almost say, practically 'every page,' only you don't know how to read it. There's no question about having any questions of *that* kind. The question is to know, for yourself, what is it you are willing to give up; that's where your trouble comes in. Not just living in accordance with the rules of Objectivity. If you are willing to sacrifice something, you would find that the rules could apply. But the rules—when you know that—they cannot attach to you. Because you

prevent them from even entering into your superficiality. You don't spend the time. You're not sufficiently honest, in earnest to wish to Work. You're very much attached. Every person is.

I'm talking about ordinary life. I'm talking about perhaps the few who want and I would like a little more for the sake of your own Soul, but before you come to such concepts of course I have to have patience. But you can grow if you wish; but then such questions, you see, which are much more involved than the questions of, "What do I do with my ordinary life because it prevents me from Working." The answer is: "Cut it out." Work! That's all; not to have all kind of negativity in you. Work!

I have said, several times, the little dodo bird on the edge of the table with Gurdjieff; and it went up and down, up and down: "Work, Work, Work." That's what we have to remember. You have to remember it when you get up. You have to remember it when you come to this Barn. You have to remember it when you have to drive the car at a low speed—nine miles an hour—and not forget it when you go out, it also applies then. Slow; controlled; with presence of yourself; to hear yourself; to measure your step sometimes. Not you just say "Hello, hello, yea, yea," and all kind of nonsense. Every once in a while, more serious. It won't do you any harm. It's very necessary to give yourself such kind of a task—aside from being honest, about which I spoke a little while ago; just good enough to be called a person interested in the work of Gurdjieff; just a little bit of an example of showing every once in a while that you try to contain yourself and perhaps wish to become acquainted and Observe yourself, if you can, Impartially.

Now, what other questions. You see, this meeting is, I call it, number 'eight.' Because there have been... Monday I started. You remember, we started with the Thursday, and a couple of weeks before that we had one meeting in New York on Monday—also questions and answers. With that one I started, and then we had Thursday; then a Monday, Thursday; Monday and Thursday; now we have a Thursday, and now it is the end of July.

There are eight tapes like that—eight discussions, eight attempts at explaining questions and some answers. It's a little collection. I would like them to be transcribed. I will ask for volunteers for that. You can give your name to the office. Do it for my sake, if you like. I would like to see those tapes together, to see if they are worthwhile enough. Correct here and there what might be a little mistake editorially; but for the rest, the sum and substance I think is enough. And then if we could collect that and mimeograph them, I would like to give them to you as a present, that you could keep it.

You don't have to pay for it. I would like to make that as a little attempt, a little bit of an advanced Christmas present for you so that you could have it, as I said in the very beginning, as a 'grammar' that might help you. The grammar of the science of Objectivity. In very simple terms, just a few aspects of Work and the application and the theory—a little—and whatever is needed for practice; for practical application; for pragmatic Work; for Objective pragmatism so that maybe in reading it, in sitting and thinking about it, you may be reminded—maybe of your own questions, maybe of the atmosphere or the time or maybe the condition under which we happened to talk—and then trying to remember that; and maybe with that you could start the day, or you could end the day, or you could carry it with you. Whichever way you want to use it for Work for yourself, not to forget what is needed, to try to remember that Work has very definitely a meaning for us and it has a meaning for you: For your Soul; for your freedom; for the reason you, I think, were born on this Earth; for the way I feel that you have to adjust your life and make allowances for the possibility of an inner growth and trying to see to what extent you can learn to place the accent of your life more and more on *that* life and not only on the superficialities.

Without losing touch with that what is outer world. Without negating it, without denying it but putting it in its proper place, in a place in *relation* to your inner life, in a place in relation to your Magnetic Center as a central point of gravity for your Being, each demanding—like all three bodies demanding, by their presence—the requirement for the maintenance in as simple a way as possible without loss of energy. And constantly in the maintenance of that, to remember why God gave us this life on this Earth and to enable us to understand, more and more, the necessity of the unity between the three bodies in becoming One as a Being. Then because that part—of Man Number One, Two, and Three; Four and Five; Six and Seven—is possible for Man on Earth to reach practical completion of his Kesdjanian body, practical completion for the Soul body; the entry—because of the 'Si-Do' of the three bodies connected with each other, then forming the triunity of the three bodies—ready to enter into levels of Being about which we have never dreamt. But, we don't have to; because it is not of our concern as yet, but the ambition one should have: To become a Man of the Cosmos and that what belongs to a Man as he can leave his self-Consciousness and enter into that what could become Impartiality regarding his own Self as a Cosmic unity.

About such things we talk. Because those are the kind of ideas that will keep us together as

a Group. I've said so often, it is not the Activities. It is not even the Barn. It is not even certain thoughts you have at a certain time. It is the maintenance of that what is the level of your Being which has to be clear to all of us and so, at times can be touched by someone else who perhaps knows a little more when we ourselves have forgotten, and in turn to help someone to be remind ... to help to remind him to remember himself. And in that process you remember *your* Self, which includes then the other person's Self-hood.

Such things I wish you would think about much and much more. Next week we will talk again a little differently. I would like this Nucleus to try to function. I would like them to answer questions. I would like for them not to have any fear. But I would like them to be present to themselves when they answer; and if they don't want to do it, it is all right, I will answer. But I would prefer them to receive your questions and then answer them. I will be here; I can help a little and perhaps at certain times help to clarify if it is not clear enough.

But the accent must be more and more on you. There will be a time you will have to be by yourself. We do not know when and it is no need to discuss it, but you must keep it in your mind that such a time will come and it is up to you all—not up to me—to see if you wish honestly to continue with the work of Gurdjieff. It's an important question, and it will require a great deal of real thought, and maybe in time some sacrifice to help to maintain that what should be the most important desire of yourself: The growth for freedom enabling you to become a real Man, and in the three bodies ... the triunity existing as a servant to the Lord.

So goodnight, I'll see you next week.

End of tape